APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,497	11/19/2003	Alok Kumar	10559-875001 / P17394	8237

20985   7590   07/03/2007

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/718,497	KUMAR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VAN H. NGUYEN	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*24 April 2007*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *16-26,33-41 and 44-51* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15,27-32,42 and 43* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>*11/19/2003*</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is responsive to the Response to Restriction Requirement

filed 04/24/2007.

Applicant's election of group I (claims 1-14, 27-32, 42, and 43), without traverse,

is acknowledged. It is noted that claim 15 also belongs to group I. Therefore,

claims 1-15, 27-32, 42, and 43 are presented for examination.

Applicant is required to cancel non-elected claims 16-26, 33-41, and 44-51 in the

next response to this office action.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected

invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b)

if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least

one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be

accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37

CFR 1.17(i).

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The Applicants' Information Disclosure Statement, filed 11/19/2003, has been

received, entered into the record, and considered.

Specification

3.   Examiner requests that Applicant review the application carefully for

informalities including typographical errors.

The disclosure is objected to because BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

is missing.

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the

disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single
paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important
that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the
abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal
phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "the," should be
avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers
in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given
in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The

disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15, 27-32, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 1:

- The term "events" (line 6) renders the claim indefinite. It is not clear if it is referring to "events" recited at line 4.

- "the execution contexts" lacks antecedent basis

As to claim 6:

"the global FIFO event queue" lacks antecedent basis.

As to claim 9:

The term "this packet" renders the claim indefinite. It is not clear which packet is referring to.

As to claim 27:

The term "events" (line 7) renders the claim indefinite. It is not clear if it is

referring to "events" recited at line 5.

Dependent claims are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their base

claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15, 27-32, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Freeman et al.** (US 6785726 B1) in view of **Hanson et al.** (US

6546425 B1).

As to claims 1, 27, and 42:

Freeman teaches dynamically binding an event context to an execution context in

response to receiving an event by: storing arriving events into an event queue that

is accessible by event contexts; storing events from the event queue in per-

execution context event queues; and associating event queues with the execution

contexts to temporarily store the events for the event context for a duration of the

binding to dynamically bind the events received on a per-event basis in the

context queues *(see the discussion beginning at col.10, line 56).*

Freeman, however, does not specifically teach a global event queue.

Hanson teaches a global event queue *(see the global queue discussion beginning*

at col.14, line 14).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Freeman with Hanson because Hanson's teaching

would have provided the capability for effectively delivering events to local and

remote servers.

As to claim 2:

Freeman teaches execution context can be in one of four states, idle, binding,

bound, or unbinding *(see Figs.3-6 and the associated text).*

As to claim 3:

Freeman teaches in the bound state, an execution context is bound to a specific

event context and the execution context processes events for that event context

and the event queue associated with that execution context is used to store events

for the event context to which it is bound *(see Figs.3-6 and the associated text)*.

As to claim 4:

Freeman teaches in the unbinding state, the execution context determines if it has

any more events to process for the event context to which it was bound and either

unbinds itself from the event context, going to idle state or begins processing

another event from that context, going back to bound state *(see Figs.3-6 and the*

associated text).

As to claim 5:

Freeman teaches in the event context can be in one of two states, unbound or

bound *(see Figs.3-6 and the associated text)*.

As to claims 6 and 43:

Hanson teaches the global FIFO event queue is used to queue events when the

events first arrive into the system *(see the global queue discussion beginning at*

col.14, line 14).

As to claims 7 and 28:

Hanson teaches maintaining execution contexts in an idle state until an event

arrives at a head of the global event queue *(see the global queue discussion*

beginning at col.14, line 14).

As to claims 8 and 29:

Freeman teaches assigning an execution context that is in idle state to process the

packet *(see Figs.3-6 and the associated text).*

As to claims 9 and 30:

Freeman teaches removing the event from the event queue; determining a event

context; and determining if the event context to which this packet belongs is

already bound to an execution context *(see Figs.3-6 and the associated text).*

As to claims 10 and 31:

Freeman teaches if the event context is already bound, binding an execution

further comprises placing the packet in the event queue of the other execution

context to which the event context associated with the packet is already bound to;

unbinding the event context; and returning to an idle state *(see Figs.3-6 and the*

associated text).

As to claims 11 and 32:

Freeman teaches if the event context is not already bound, binding an execution

further comprises binding the execution context to that event context by updating

a state of the execution context from idle to bound, updating the state of the event

context from "not bound" to bound, and recording that this execution context is

bound to this event context; and processing the event *(see Figs.3-6 and the*

associated text).

As to claim 12:

Freeman teaches when the execution context completes processing an event, the

execution context transitions to an unbinding state *(see Figs. 3-6 and the*

associated text).

As to claim 13:

Freeman teaches when the execution context completes processing an event, the

execution context checks its event queue for additional events to process *(see*

Figs. 3-6 and the associated text).

As to claim 14:

Freeman teaches if there is at least one event in the queue, the execution context

returns to the bound state, removes the packet from the queue and processes the

packet, otherwise the execution context unbinds itself from the event context,-and

transitions to an idle state *(see Figs. 3-6 and the associated text).*

As to claim 15:

Freeman teaches the events are packets *(see Figs. 3-6 and the associated text).*

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record, see PTO 892, and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant should review these references

carefully before responding to this office action.

Contact Information

7.   Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should
be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is
(571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday
from 8:30AM-6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday. If
attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, WILLIAM THOMSON can be reached at (571) 272-3718.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or
proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR
only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-
direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

VAN H. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER